

**Kansas Administrative Regulations
Economic Impact Statement
For the Kansas Division of the Budget**

Kansas Dept of Agriculture
Agency

Ronda Hutton
Agency Contact

(785) 564-6715
Contact Phone Number

K.A.R. 9-3-9
K.A.R. Number(s)

Submit a hard copy of the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s) and any external documents that the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s) would adopt, along with the following to: Division of the Budget
900 SW Jackson, Room 504-N
Topeka, KS 66612

I. Brief description of the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s).

Removes the negative brucellosis test requirement for imported adult domesticated cervids. It also adds the genera, Rangifer (reindeer and caribou) to the list of cervids required to have a five-year chronic wasting disease (CWD) herd status before being imported into the state.

II. Statement by the agency if the rule(s) and regulation(s) is mandated by the federal government and a statement if approach chosen to address the policy issue is different from that utilized by agencies of contiguous states or the federal government. (If the approach is different, then include a statement of why the Kansas rule and regulation proposed is different)

This regulation will add the genera, Rangifer, to those cervid genera that are required to have a negative CWD herd status before they will be allowed import to Kansas. This requirement exceeds the current United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) requirements because the susceptibility of the Rangifer genera has just been established.

III. Agency analysis specifically addressing following:

A. The extent to which the rule(s) and regulation(s) will enhance or restrict business activities and growth;

Removal of the brucellosis testing requirement may enhance business activity by reducing the regulatory requirements currently in place for imported cervids by no longer requiring testing. Entities importing reindeer and caribou will potentially see an increase in restrictions and testing requirements to qualify as part of the USDA-Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service herd certification program to import those animals into the state.

B. The economic effect, including a detailed quantification of implementation and compliance costs, on the specific businesses, sectors, public utility ratepayers, individuals, and local governments that would be affected by the proposed rule and regulation and on the state economy as a whole;

No significant impact is expected on local or state entities. Minimal savings may occur due to the reduction in inspections and paperwork review costs by KDA. Cervid importers may also see some small savings in paperwork and verification costs. Reindeer and caribou owners may incur increased costs by locating USDA certified herds or for certifying their own herds.

DOB APPROVAL STAMP

APPROVED

MAY 07 2020

DIVISION OF THE BUDGET

C. Businesses that would be directly affected by the proposed rule and regulation;

Farmers and ranchers importing cervids from specific listed genera.

D. Benefits of the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s) compared to the costs;

Cost is minimal or none for Kansas entities. The redaction of the brucellosis testing requirement will potentially allow for importation at a reduced cost to producers. Addition of reindeer and caribou to the CWD susceptible species list and the subsequent certification required will increase the due diligence and potential cost of importation for herds outside of Kansas.

E. Measures taken by the agency to minimize the cost and impact of the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s) on business and economic development within the State of Kansas, local government, and individuals;

Steps required for entry into Kansas will be the responsibility of importing party.

F. An estimate, expressed as a total dollar figure, of the total annual implementation and compliance costs that are reasonably expected to be incurred by or passed along to business, local governments, or members of the public.

\$0

An estimate, expressed as a total dollar figure, of the total implementation and compliance costs that are reasonably expected to be incurred by or passed along to business, local governments, or members of the public.

\$0

Do the above total implementation and compliance costs exceed \$3.0 million over any two-year period?

YES ☐ NO ☒

Give a detailed statement of the data and methodology used in estimating the above cost estimate.

Regulation compliance costs will be incurred by importing party. No expected financial impact on Kansas producers

Prior to the submission or resubmission of the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s), did the agency hold a public hearing if the total implementation and compliance costs exceed \$3.0 million over any two-year period to find that the estimated costs have been accurately determined and are necessary for achieving legislative intent? If applicable, document when the public hearing was held, those in attendance, and any pertinent information from the hearing.

YES ☐ NO ☒

G. If the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s) increases or decreases revenues of cities, counties or school districts, or imposes functions or responsibilities on cities, counties or

DOB APPROVAL STAMP

APPROVED

MAY 07 2020

DIVISION OF THE BUDGET

school districts that will increase expenditures or fiscal liability, describe how the state agency consulted with the League of Kansas Municipalities, Kansas Association of Counties, and/or the Kansas Association of School Boards.

The proposed regulation was mailed to the League of Kansas Municipalities, Kansas Association of Counties and the Kansas Association of School Boards for review and comments. No comments have been received from the entities.

H. Describe how the agency consulted and solicited information from businesses, associations, local governments, state agencies, or institutions and members of the public that may be affected by the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s).

The proposed regulation was sent to the Kansas livestock stakeholder associations such as Kansas Livestock Association (KLA) and Kansas Farm Bureau. It was presented at the KLA annual conference for review and discussion. It was also presented to the Animal Health Advisory board for review and comments.

I. For environmental rule(s) and regulation(s) describe the costs that would likely accrue if the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s) are not adopted, as well as the persons would bear the costs and would be affected by the failure to adopt the rule(s) and regulation(s).

Not applicable.

DOB APPROVAL STAMP

APPROVED

MAY 07 2020

DIVISION OF THE BUDGET